

Special Meeting

Town Hall Renovation Building Committee

January 17, 2024

5 PM

Scotland Volunteer Community Hall

MEETING MINUTES (unapproved)

1. Call to Order

- a. Gary Greenberg called the meeting to order at 5:02 PM.
 - i. *Present:* Gary Greenberg, Jim Troeger, Brynn Lipstreu, Michael Brandes, John Aldrich, and Terry Delaney. Dana Barrow, First Selectman present at 7PM.
 - ii. *Absent:* Ben Hubbard.
 - iii. *Also present:*
 1. Andrew Woodstock from Eastern Connecticut Housing Opportunities.
 2. Sara Nelson, Nelson Edwards Architects, and their subcontractor reps.
 3. Robert Gabalski, Lothrop Associates, and their subcontractor reps.

2. Additions to the Agenda

- a. None

3. Presentation by Lothrop Associates and Discussion to Follow

- a. Introduction and presentation from **Robert Gabalski, Lothrop Associates.**
- b. T. Delaney asked about community engagement, which is necessary for one of our grants – Gabalski confirmed that it's included in the proposal, no additional cost.
- c. G. Greenberg asked about Lothrop projects that are closest in scope to ours – Gabalski described the Hartford City Hall rehabilitation project. Greenberg asked for more information about historic preservation, Gabalski expanded on their experience with historic preservation projects.
- d. T. Delaney asked for more information about how Lothrop would support the Town of Scotland in our relationship with SHPO, should we pursue additional funds from SHPO – Gabalski described Lothrop's role as liaison and their past and current experience working with SHPO.
- e. T. Delaney asked about specific problem areas in our Town Hall – Gabalski expanded on various issues such as temporary framing in the attic and deficiencies in the basement.
- f. G. Greenberg asked Gabalski for thoughts about the existing master schematic plan, which was created by another firm – Gabalski praised the existing plan and confirmed that Lothrop would likely move forward with it as-is.
- g. A. Woodstock added, on the topic of hazardous materials removal, that the state will require abatement of known hazardous materials, likely full removal.

- h. In closing – Gabalski thinks the budget is very lean; actual cost of proposed project will likely be over \$2M. Alternates and options will need to be aggressively pursued in design development phase.
- i. Introduction and presentation from **Bob Deluca, CLA Engineers** – general engineering subcontractor of Lothrop Associates
 - i. T. Delaney asked if CLA Engineers will perform environmental surveys, if needed – Deluca confirmed their capabilities conducting outdoor environmental surveys.
 - ii. G. Greenberg asked about LULA (elevator) foundation engineering – Deluca described the design requirements. Discussion followed.
- j. Introduction and presentation from **Tom Newbold, Landmark Facilities Group** - systems engineer subcontractor of Lothrop Associates
 - i. G. Greenberg asked about necessary testing/evaluation with regards to geothermal – Newbold described the evaluation process, and how the geothermal well is drilled. Discussion followed.

4. Presentation by Nelson Edwards and Discussion to Follow

- a. Introduction and presentation from **Sara Nelson, Nelson Edwards**
- b. Early opening remarks from Nelson indicate that the project budget is extremely lean. Committee should pay careful attention to cost reductions/alternates.
- c. T. Delaney asked if Nelson Edwards or their associates would be available for public meetings about the town hall renovation – Nelson confirmed that they would be available.
- d. J. Troeger asked about whether Nelson thought the renovations would exceed 50% of the building footprint and therefore require that the entire building be brought up to code – Nelson confirmed that they are treating the project as exceeding 50% and their plan is to bring the entire building up to code, or as close as possible (considering exemptions as a historic building).
- e. T. Delaney asked about restrictions for putting solar on historic buildings – Nelson answered that there are regulations that protect the right to install energy efficient devices on buildings regardless of historic status.
- f. T. Delaney asked whether it makes sense to consider geothermal if the budget is already tight – Gary Defillippo (consulting engineer, GDDI) answered that it may not make sense to do geothermal on this budget; there are other high efficiency alternatives that cost less.
- g. G. Greenberg asked the presenters what issues they are most concerned about with this project
 - i. Lisa MacCartney – East Wharf Architects : Scope is a concern. We should be reducing the scope to protect the budget.
 - ii. Matthew Maynard - Towne Engineering : drainage can be a wildcard on old sites where earth materials have been dumped for many years.
 - iii. Charles Brown – GNCB Consulting Eng. : old buildings have a lot of surprises. Could be troublesome framing hiding under the walls.

- iv. Thomas MacDonald - East Wharf Architects : always encourages considering what resources the town has to contribute to the project to save costs. Also, it's very important to keep communication open; ask questions, seek clarification.
 - v. Sara Nelson – Nelson Edwards : the committee should consider forming subcommittees for initiatives like seeking additional grants/funding.
 - h. G. Greenberg asked about hazardous materials testing – T. MacDonald recommended a line item for hazardous material testing; there are known hazardous materials, and there will be surprise hazardous materials.
 - i. J. Troeger asked whether the committee should immediately cut geothermal from planning/discussions, considering other possible cost-cutting measures – G. Defillippo recommended that we consider other options for heating to stay within budget and we'll still come out with a high efficiency system.
 - j. J. Troeger asked if alternates will be identified in the design documents that go to bid – S. Nelson cautioned that too many alternates create variability in the construction bids; ideally we consider and eliminate alternates prior to finalizing design docs.
 - k. Dana Barrows, First Selectman, asked about how Nelson Edwards charges for a change order – S. Nelson answered that they are contractually obligated to meet the town's budget, so change order fees should only come into play if there was a budget surplus and new work is requested.
5. Set next meeting date
- a. **Next meeting set for January 25, 2024 at 3:45PM at the Town Hall. Executive Session expected.**
6. Approval of Minutes-12/28/23 and 1/10/24
- a. **Motion by T. Delaney to approve the 12/28/23 and 1/10/24 meeting minutes with no corrections, seconded by B. Lipstreu. Motion carried unanimously.**
7. Adjournment
- a. **Motion by B. Lipstreu to adjourn at 7:46 PM, seconded by J. Troeger. Motion carried unanimously.**

John Aldrich, Secretary